

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

FEBRUARY 13, 2014

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in Conference Room D of Building A of the Norman Municipal Complex, 201 West Gray Street, on the 13th day of February 2014. Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <http://www.normanok.gov/content/boards-commissions> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Vice Chair Sandy Bahan called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Curtis McCarty
Jim Gasaway
Andy Sherrer
Cindy Gordon
Sandy Bahan

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dave Boeck
Tom Knotts
Chris Lewis
Robertta Pailles

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner
Janay Greenlee, Planner II
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Leah Messner, Asst. City Attorney
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst II
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer

* * *

Item No. 2, being:

ACCEPTANCE OF RESIGNATION AND ELECTION OF CHAIR FOR 2014

Andy Sherrer moved to accept the resignation of Roberta Pailles as Chair. Jim Gasaway seconded the motion.

YEAS	Curtis McCarty, Jim Gasaway, Andy Sherrer, Cindy Gordon, Sandy Bahan
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Roberta Pailles, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Dave Boeck

The motion to accept Ms. Pailles' resignation as Chair passed by a vote of 5-0.

Vice Chair Bahan asked for nominations for the position of Chair for 2014.

Andy Sherrer nominated Sandy Bahan as Chair for 2014. Curtis McCarty seconded the nomination.

Vice Chair Bahan asked if there were any other nominations.

Mr. McCarty asked about postponing the election until everyone is present.

Mr. Sherrer withdrew his motion.

Andy Sherrer moved to postpone the election of a Chair until the March 13, 2014 meeting. Jim Gasaway seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Curtis McCarty, Jim Gasaway, Andy Sherrer, Cindy Gordon, Sandy Bahan
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Roberta Pailles, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Dave Boeck

The motion to postpone the election of a Chair passed by a vote of 5-0.

* * *

NON-CONSENT ITEMS

Item No. 4, being:

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 9, 2014 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

Curtis McCarty moved to approve the minutes of the January 9, 2014 Regular Meeting as presented. Andy Sherrer seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Curtis McCarty, Jim Gasaway, Andy Sherrer, Cindy Gordon, Sandy Bahan
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Roberta Pailles, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Dave Boeck

The motion to approve the minutes of the January 9, 2014 Regular Meeting passed by a vote of 5-0.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:

LANDMARK LAND, L.L.C. – SOUTHWEST CORNER OF TECUMSEH ROAD AND 12TH AVENUE N.E.

5A. R-1314-46 -- LANDMARK LAND, L.L.C., REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION, HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION, AND COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION, TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION AND COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF TECUMSEH ROAD AND 12TH AVENUE N.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report
3. Pre-Development Summary
4. Excerpt of Planning Commission Minutes – January 9, 2014

5B. O-1314-21 -- LANDMARK LAND, L.L.C., REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-1, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, RM-2, LOW DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, PL, PARKLAND, AND C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT; AND FROM RM-2, LOW DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, AND RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, TO C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; AND FROM R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF TECUMSEH ROAD AND 12TH AVENUE N.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative
4. Preliminary Site Development Plan
5. Open Space Exhibit
6. Phasing Plan

5C. PP-1314-8 -- CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY LANDMARK LAND, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR MONTORO RIDGE ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, (EXCLUDING THE COMMERCIAL PROPERTY AND RURAL AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY FROM THE PUD), FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF TECUMSEH ROAD AND 12TH AVENUE N.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Preliminary Plat with Contours
4. Staff Report
5. Transportation Impacts
6. Preliminary Site Development Plan
7. Preliminary Site Plan
8. Open Space Exhibit
9. Phasing Plan
10. Pre-Development Summary
11. Greenbelt Commission Comments

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson – The first application for this proposal is for the Norman 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan amendment. This is the existing Land Use and Transportation Plan in that area. As you can see, it does have low density residential, medium, high density residential and then the commercial at the corner. As proposed, the new land use for the PUD area would be the low density residential and then the commercial designation will stay intact.

Then the second application for the area is the rezoning request. Rezoning to a Planned Unit Development, amending the C-1, Local Commercial District with Special Use for a building

in excess of 35,000 square feet and an automobile service station, and then an additional expansion to the A-2, Rural Agricultural District. This is the existing zoning. As you can see, the hatched area will become the Planned Unit Development for the larger lot, single family homes. Then in the southeast corner there is a well site which has the existing oil well. That will expand slightly to the west, creating more of a buffer there for the single family homes that would be on the west side. Then up in the corner, the commercial district will expand slightly to the south, taking in some of the RM-6 and RM-2 area, and then slightly shifting east giving a little bit of that area over to the PUD development. This is the existing land use in the area. Essentially, it is surrounded on all sides by single family development. In addition to that, on the southeast corner at 12th and Tecumseh there is a mini-storage facility there denoted with the red buildings.

This is also for the preliminary plat. It just designates the plat location.

These are a few slides of the area. This is the site itself, which would be on the southwest corner of 12th and Tecumseh. This is another shot of the area looking south. In the distance there was the oil well; you can see how buffered it will be from the single family homes. On the north side, which would be the northwest corner of Tecumseh and 12th is Red Canyon Ranch. This is also the single family development there. The northeast corner is undeveloped at this time. This is the mini-storage area with single family to the south of that. This addition wraps around the church.

This proposal will accommodate 67 larger lots for single family homes. There is a pipeline that runs along the east side of this development up toward the commercial area and then north. The PUD narrative acknowledges that fences will not be placed along the easement, but they can cross the easement, and they will also have to leave access for those employees or inspectors to be able to get in there and inspect those lines. The area has developed with residential and commercial in recent years and, in addition to the expansion and improvements on Tecumseh Road, staff recommends approval of Resolution No. R-1314-46, Ordinance No. O-1314-21, as well as the preliminary plat PP-1314-8. The applicant is here with a presentation and to answer any questions.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Tom McCaleb, engineer for the applicant – This drawing will probably be the basis of everything I've got to say. That's the preliminary plat. You know where it's located. You kind of know some history of this tract of land. It's been zoned since 1984, and there are several different zoning classifications. We are trying to develop this land and we turned in an application in September to have this as a PUD with septic tanks and large lots. It was trying to copy Montecito, which is on the east. After turning it in, we met with staff and staff was of the opinion that this area would not lend itself to septic tanks. So they were requiring that we provide public sewer because public sewer is available. So with that requirement, we went back to the developer. We did a cost analysis to see how that would work out. After the analysis, after review of the site, and with those issues that were brought up by staff, we brought it back. We resubmitted this tract of land as a different PUD. We still want to keep the rural area. We're doing the PUD mainly to keep no curbs, and the streets, and the bar ditch section. Other than that, it's standard single family – big lots. The lot sizes vary from 0.48 acres to about 1.6 acres. So they vary from half an acre to over an acre and a half. There were several issues we had to contend with. Jane mentioned some of them. Pipeline, which is right yonder. Plains pipeline, and we've modified it and we're going to put it in this configuration here. We also are rezoning a piece of land for the oil well. This piece right there is the A-2 land that we're rezoning back from R-1 to A-2 to give the separation from the house to the oil well. That's about two acres. We're adding some area to the commercial and taking away some area from the commercial to make sure to get to the area that works with the single family layout. So, essentially, that's our application.

The issues for sanitary sewer I explained. All the lots will be served with sanitary sewer systems that will drain back to the west. This corner, which is not part of the PUD – that's just straight zoning. We're just leaving it alone. So its existing zoning is in place; we're just modifying the size of it. C-1 was sewerred to a line that's coming across going to the Red Canyon Ranch

project. So the sewer is there, it's available, and we're connecting to it. Standard sewer connections; no septic tanks.

The water lines – there's a 12-inch water line on Tecumseh Road and we're tying to that line, but there's a pressure zone in here that we're having to modify because it's two different pressure systems. So we're adding a sustaining valve right here to separate those two systems. Also, we're going to take the water line and we're going to loop it and we're going to tie it in to the Shadowlake Addition in that street. And we're going to loop the water line and tie it into the water line in The Vineyard Addition. So all the water lines will be standard water lines and will be looped and a pressure zone will be identified.

Storm sewer – drainage – the tract has got some pretty good undulations. We're going to try not to tear up any more than we have to. That's the purpose of making the large lots. But we've got to comply with the standard drainage ordinance, which we're doing. This is a large buffer we're leaving as it is and making it an open space. You see those contour lines – that represents drainage. On the west side of this road, that's our detention pond. We've also established in this area a revised WQPZ – Water Quality Protection Zone. We've had to initiate and prepare a design for an engineered solution for the WQPZ and we've done it. Those dashed lines that you see there represent that protected area – the WQPZ there and there. We're also going to add that to our open space solution for the whole project. We've got about seven places that we've identified as open space – medians, this large tract, a tract over here, the WQPZ and there's six places specifically that are identified that add up to about 10.5% open space. So we meet those criteria of the PUD requirements.

We reviewed the traffic situation and it's surprising that this tract of land did not warrant a traffic study. There are no traffic concerns, and we got a letter from the traffic engineering consultants who we hired to look at the traffic and they say that the traffic generated from this development would not be expected to have a significant impact on the street system. Staff has agreed to that. If you look in your staff report, page 5c-9, you'll see their response as well.

We've talked about the oil well issue already. It sits right here. It's a live well and we're going to leave it alone, stay away from it and move away from it.

As I said, we've got six open space tracts. We've got 6.4 acres of open space, over 10% open space area.

There was some concern about the public school area, which is this area that is set aside for the school system. Some concern of how are you going to get to it. There's an existing road coming from Shadowlake that's already access to it. Staff has asked, and we've concurred to add another access point right there. So, with that, if it ever happens, it would have public access. The developer has also agreed to put sidewalks in this subdivision. So sidewalks will be along all the streets that can get kids to the school. So it's a complete system with all those infrastructures. That's my report. I'd be glad to respond to any questions. We ask for your support.

2. Ms. Bahan – Have you talked at all to the school district about their plans for that property?
3. Mr. McCaleb – No, we have not.
4. Ms. Bahan – I know when they did the study several years ago they recommended that another elementary school be built in the northeast part of the area and that would be probably one of the areas they would consider for that. It wasn't in the bond issue this time.
5. Mr. McCaleb – That's correct. There are no immediate plans that I'm aware of. We've tried to figure out a way to get a sidewalk through the tract, but we can't encumber that land because we don't own it. We're doing fee in lieu of now for park land. We've tried to accommodate the school tract – if it ever happens.
6. Mr. McCarty – Did you say you're doing bar ditch or curb and gutter?

7. Mr. McCaleb – Bar ditch. No curb and gutter.
8. Mr. McCarty – So where would the sidewalks go?
9. Mr. McCaleb – They have to go on the lot side of the bar ditch.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Jim Gasaway moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-46, Ordinance No. O-1314-21, and PP-1314-8, the Preliminary Plat for MONTORO RIDGE ADDITION, A Planned Unit Development (excluding the Commercial Property and Rural Agricultural Property from the PUD) to City Council. Curtis McCarty seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Curtis McCarty, Jim Gasaway, Andy Sherrer, Cindy Gordon, Sandy Bahan
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Roberta Pailles, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-46, Ordinance No. O-1314-21, and PP-1314-8 to City Council, passed by a vote of 5-0.

* * *

Item No. 6, being:

NICHOLAS ROBERT CORPORATION – 213 E. TONHAWA STREET

6A. R-1314-97 -- NICHOLAS ROBERT CORPORATION REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 213 E. TONHAWA STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report
3. Pre-Development Summary

6B. O-1314-34 -- NICHOLAS ROBERT CORPORATION REQUESTS REZONING FROM CO, SUBURBAN OFFICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, TO R-3, MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 213 E. TONHAWA STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Site Plan
4. Exterior Rendering
5. Applicant's General Commentary and Attachments

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Janay Greenlee – We're here for a proposal by the Nicholas Robert Corporation for a Norman 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan amendment from low density residential to medium density residential at 213 East Tonhawa. The existing land use is low density for the subject tract with office on both the east and west sides, and immediately abutting it also is low density residential. This is the proposed to medium density residential for the Land Use Plan amendment.

We're also doing a rezoning from CO, Suburban Office Commercial, to R-3, Multi-Family Dwelling District. This is the subject tract with R-3 on both sides and CO at both the east and west ends of that street. Right now the existing land use is vacant.

These are a few pictures of the site. This is, in fact, the site -- the vacant piece of land with a single family house on the west side and a duplex on the east side. Both of them are currently rental properties. This is across the street looking to the south. At the east end is a sign shop. Across the street from there is a church. This gives you an idea of the mix of uses in the area. Directly across the street looking to the south is another R-3. It has some apartments that are in the back. Terry's Automotive is across the street with offices at the west end on the south side of Tonhawa. This is the alley, which will be primary access for this development. On the left side of the screen is ABLE, which is the center for adults with developmental disabilities. This is the rear of the site, looking south, where the proposed parking lot will be with the building in front. There is a small single family home which is now a salon, just an idea of the mix of uses in the area. More offices. At the end of Tonhawa that abuts Jones, there will soon be a new restaurant – we just had a zoning go through from I-1 to C-3 so there will be a restaurant right down the street. Parking lot to the west end of Tonhawa.

This is a site plan that has been submitted by the applicant. This is a three-story townhouse with three units. Parking spaces proposed – he meets the required 1.8 per unit. He's offering a little bit more parking to hopefully not have on-street parking. There is on-street parking on Tonhawa on the south side of the street, however. This is the artist's rendering of the building.

Staff does support the land use amendment change and the zoning. It has met all the requirements for that. As you know, this is kind of the Original Township site, has gone through a lot of changes, mainly was mostly residential up until recent history. In this area, most land

around it is commercial, office and R-3. Staff does support Resolution No. R-1314-97 and Ordinance No. O-1314-34. There were no written protests received.

2. Mr. McCarty – In R-3, remind me what the height requirements are. Is there any maximum height?

3. Ms. Greenlee – In R-3 it's three stories. It's by stories.

4. Mr. McCarty – Are they one bedroom units? Two bedroom units? Do we know?

5. Ms. Greenlee – His proposal is for each one of them to have four bedrooms. They're three stories. The first level is going to be the living/kitchen area. The second and the third will be the bedrooms.

6. Mr. McCarty – So you're talking about potentially 12 people living there? I know the parking requirements, but how many parking spots is he providing?

7. Ms. Greenlee – There are 16 that he initially has proposed. The four that aren't hatched are being proposed. We have 12 right now that we're looking at. And that's mainly to do with the coverage. The lot exceeds the requirement for this type of building. It's 10,500 square feet. The building and the paved areas come right below that, as you can see. If he has the ability to prove detention, he may propose those other four spots, but that wouldn't come until we go through the permitting process to make sure that he is within the requirements of coverage and detention.

8. Mr. Gasaway – I noticed that in the Pre-Development conference the issue came up about the City ordinance prohibiting more than three unrelated persons in a residence.

9. Ms. Greenlee – That was a concern, and that is up to the management. This corporation is going to manage this property, will be the one that's leasing and keeping the property up. It will be up to them to ensure that they follow that ordinance. They are well aware of it.

10. Mr. Gasaway – Four bedrooms opens up that possibility.

11. Mr. McCarty – Does that apply in R-3?

12. Ms. Greenlee – The three unrelated is strictly up to the landlord to ensure that they are not going to rent to three or more unrelated. Once that does happen, that's basically driven on a complaint basis and then it will go to our code enforcement if he does happen to break it. He did assure everybody that was at Pre-Development that, from his standpoint, these are upper scale townhouses. He wants to have yearly leases. They're not going to be by semester or renting rooms out to students individually. It will be under one lease. Anybody that leases one of the units from him will have to prove that, obviously, they don't have the three or more unrelated.

13. Ms. Gordon – I'm having heartburn with this. I don't know about anybody else. You have four bedrooms per unit and this is an upscale property.

14. Ms. Greenlee – The applicant is here. He doesn't have a presentation but he would be happy to answer any questions.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Scott Sidwell, 743 N.W. 99th Street in Oklahoma City, representing the applicant, was available to answer questions.

2. Ms. Gordon – You want these to be more upscale and there are four bedrooms per unit. I'm just finding it hard to understand your target audience, if you will, to be able to fill a four-bedroom townhome with families that would need four bedrooms, other than the student population. I guess I worry that you won't be able to fill them and then the temptation will be there to have student population of unrelated.

3. Mr. Sidwell – Our previous experience – our demographics is what we would refer to as renters by choice. As I had mentioned to the zoning staff, we own another property here in Norman that the neighbors next door bought the house for the sole purpose of attending OU football games, and they're here during that time only; they live in Lawton. Our other communities, as an example, are two-bedroom units but the majority of those units, because they are \$1.05 to \$1.25 per foot rental rates, are used as closets and second bedrooms. So just because I use the word "bedroom," I highly doubt that we would even have four people in the unit. These would be families that have a daughter or two that need a place for them to stay that have the types of moneys that the rents that we would require and the fact that the other two bedrooms are empty is not relative to the conversation from our viewpoint. I can see your heartburn, as you refer to it.

4. Ms. Gordon – Are there many other three story buildings in that area? I know there's a lot of commercial, but it seems like kind of a large footprint for that.

5. Mr. Sidwell – Now we do conserve space height-wise because of the flat roof and we're using Sips panels, so our floor spaces are only six and a half inches. We save a couple of feet overall there. The church down the street, even though it's just two stories, by the time you put the peak on there it's 35 feet tall or so.

6. Ms. Gordon – And there were no complaints from the immediate neighbors, specifically the residential which was right to the west?

7. Mr. Sidwell – That would be the Grishams. She had concerns, obviously, because that's their family's home. It's a rental property currently, but she had mentioned that she might, in fact, move back into it at some point. I did not leave the meeting feeling that there was undue concern.

8. Mr. Sherrer – I couldn't tell on the outside exterior façade – I know it was mentioned. Tell me a little bit more about what your plan is there. I'm just curious.

9. Mr. Sidwell – It will be very contemporary. And they did have some concerns about that as compatible architecture. We'll have stucco, masonry, and architectural panels on the skin of the building.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Ellen Frank, 211 East Daws – I'm in the 350 foot perimeter for notification. I have a couple of questions. I'm not at all against infill. I welcome it. I think that some nice townhouses that are properly managed and proper architecture and so on would be an addition to the neighborhood, but I have some real concerns that I think – and part of it isn't just a concern for this property, but partially what it sets a precedent for and how our neighborhood is looked at. One of my first questions that kind of surprised me when I heard the presentation was my notice said the property is currently zoned CO – commercial. I didn't realize that it was R-2 and going to R-3 – that those were separate issues. That wasn't addressed in the letter that was sent to us. So I'm not sure how that – maybe someone can explain that to me so I understand that. I thought it was zoned commercial.

2. Ms. Connors – Commercial Office. CO.

3. Ms. Frank – So the land use is separate from how it's zoned?

4. Ms. Connors – Yes. The Land Use Plan and the zoning map are two separate documents.

5. Ms. Frank – Okay. That's one question. I guess I'm not sure I want it changed if that's to R-3. I certainly think it's better than commercial. But also one of my questions is – and it was not announced to us in the notification that that was going to be a change – just that it was going to go from commercial – that it would be rezoned.

In the discussion of what this area is like, the description goes from the Tonhawa alley south to Gray Street and over to Jones and over to Ponca. Directly north of the alley that this abuts is totally residential. It's single family. There's one duplex and then you go north in Old Silk Stocking and it is predominantly residential. I feel kind of uncomfortable that, when the description is given, what we see is south a block and then two or three blocks east and west, which makes it look like it is predominantly commercial surrounding this property. And that is not accurate. It is accurate south, of course, but it is totally residential of some variety north and it's Old Silk Stocking. I notice in the report that it says – and maybe this is something I don't understand and somebody can explain – the Original Townsite. How does that relate to Old Silk Stocking? Are they two different designations?

6. Ms. Connors – Those are just neighborhood areas.

7. Ms. Frank – No – well, you see, the Old Silk Stocking, in the 2025 Plan, goes to Gray and it is not the Original Townsite – at least that's not what it's called in the 2025 map. And when you talk about that these – the old homes may become commercial, I think a lot of people are going – or right now are in process of trying to preserve these old single family homes. As a matter of fact, and I spoke to this at the Pre-Development meeting, along Crawford north, south of Robinson, but just north of Tonhawa and Daws, people are moving back who lived there when they were children and now they're grandparents and they're renovating the small, single family homes there. And then bigger homes on Peters. So I think it's really important that we think about how this neighborhood – because I call it a neighborhood – is going to develop in the future. One of the reasons that I think Ms. Gordon had appropriate questions is that this is a four-bedroom – each one of these units, just as she spoke to and my understanding was the rent is going to be like \$1,600 a month. Is that correct? So that, if a parent decides that they want to spend \$1,600 a month and have four students living there – I mean, I'm not saying that's a good idea, but that sounds like what would happen, especially if you started out with sixteen parking places. I mean, you wouldn't have that many parking places for three families. I'm not saying I'm opposed to this project; I'm saying how can we put some parameters on it so that it fits into the neighborhood and it doesn't – I've been, for a short time, a property manager for a neighborhood around the University and I know what the problems can be. And even though you have a wealthy parent who could afford to spend \$1,600 a month and get two of their children and two of their children's friends to rent, it doesn't necessarily mean that they're going to be good renters. Now, I've lived near students and I've been perfectly happy with them. So I don't want to say students are – I don't want to live near students. But how can we ensure that this is going to be compatible with our neighborhood? Do you people have some suggestions on that?

8. Ms. Gordon – I have a question for staff. Is Old Silk Stocking a CDGB neighborhood?

9. Ms. Frank – Yes. Oh, sorry.

10. Ms. Gordon – That's fine. It's for whoever can answer. Because that was a concern of mine when I first looked at that with that area – and I live in First Courthouse. So I know one of the big issues with these neighborhoods, particularly CDGB neighborhoods, is the creep that

we're kind of getting from commercial and how to preserve the residential. That was a concern of mine. When I looked at this, this is really kind of the northern stop of what seems to be right now the commercial. But I can see how the concern would be that we would continue to slowly kind of peck away at the residential part of this neighborhood and I think that is a valid concern and I think that's one that somebody in the City or your neighborhood needs to address and kind of work on – at some point, the creep needs to stop to maintain. So I don't have an answer for that, but I will tell you that that was a concern of mine. However, when I saw the street that this was on and darn near everything else on this street – right. But I think that that is something that is a serious concern and needs to be looked at.

11. Ms. Frank – But one of my concerns, and I asked the Planning staff – because this happened at the last – when we had the Commission meeting about the restaurant that's going to be on Jones – that the Planning Commission calls us a high density neighborhood. Now, yes, that is on the alley also there, but if you just turn your head around, it's not high density in the sense of big apartment buildings and it worries me that the Planning Department looks at this area as some kind of high density commercial district. And this is the 2025 Plan and this is the Old Silk Stocking neighborhood that goes down to Main Street. I took this off the computer just before the Pre-Development meeting.

12. Mr. McCarty – Just looking down Tonhawa Street right now at the current zoning. We already have C-3, I-1, C-3, CO, R-3, R-3, CO, CO, R-3, C-2 all the way down the whole street. So there's already existing other zonings on this whole street. You go over another block to Daws, there is some mixed in C-2 as well. So it's already kind of a mixed zoned area.

13. Ms. Frank – Right. And I think that's something our neighborhood needs to look at. But, in fact – and I think that's been addressed in some of the neighborhood issues that have been on the website – that, in fact, it's not very high density north of Tonhawa, but the zoning is so out of sync – and that's one of the reasons I was disappointed in a way that high density stopped all of a sudden and we lost what protection we might have, because it was supposed to include our – the original high density meetings were supposed to include – we were part of the core neighborhood. Those are my concerns and however it can be fixed so that we are protected – I really would appreciate it, and I'm sure the neighbors would, because if you drive down Daws just on the other side of the alley that we're talking about there's a vacant lot but all the others are low residential.

14. Mr. McCarty – Janay, is this actually in Silk Stockings? This proposal?

15. Ms. Greenlee – I do not know the boundaries of Silk Stocking, so I can't speak to that. I do know that, from the plat, that it is the Original Township site. The neighborhood boundaries for Silk Stocking I can't really speak to.

16. Mr. McCarty – I was just curious, because there was a neighborhood study done on Silk Stocking already. I didn't think the boundary went quite this far, but I could be wrong. That's why I was asking.

17. Ms. Frank – This is the 2025 Plan and I don't know how that relates to this.

18. Ms. Connors – This is in Old Silk Stocking neighborhood. The boundary line goes down to Main.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Curtis McCarty moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-97 and Ordinance No. O-1314-34 to the City Council. Cindy Gordon seconded the motion.

1. Mr. McCarty – I, personally, don't think that it's inappropriate for the current area and the current zoning. I understand the creep, and as you look into a block or two away, possibly they could protect that. But if you look at this current block, there's already duplex next door. You've got commercial. You've got industrial. I think it would enhance the area. I don't think it's going to hurt.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Curtis McCarty, Cindy Gordon
NAYES	Jim Gasaway, Andy Sherrer, Sandy Bahan
MEMBERS ABSENT	Roberta Pailles, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend approval of Resolution No. R-1314-97 and Ordinance No. O-1314-34 to City Council, failed by a vote of 2-3.

* * *

Item No. 7, being:

SHAY DEVELOPMENT – EAST LINDSEY STREET

7A. R-1314-98 -- SHAY DEVELOPMENT REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM FUTURE URBAN SERVICE AREA TO CURRENT URBAN SERVICE AREA FOR PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF LINDSEY STREET APPROXIMATELY ½ MILE EAST OF 24TH AVENUE S.E.

7B. O-1314-35 -- SHAY DEVELOPMENT REQUESTS REZONING FROM A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF LINDSEY STREET APPROXIMATELY ½ MILE EAST OF 24TH AVENUE S.E.

7C. PP-1314-13 -- CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY SHAY DEVELOPMENT (MORRIS ENGINEERING & SURVEYING) FOR STONE LAKE ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF LINDSEY STREET APPROXIMATELY ½ MILE EAST OF 24TH AVENUE S.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Memo
3. Applicant's Request for Postponement

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to postpone Resolution No. R-1314-98, Ordinance No. O-1314-35 and PP-1314-13, the preliminary plat for STONE LAKE ADDITION, to the March 13, 2014 meeting. Jim Gasaway seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Curtis McCarty, Jim Gasaway, Andy Sherrer, Cindy Gordon, Sandy Bahan,
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Roberta Pailles, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to postpone Resolution No. R-1314-98, Ordinance No. O-1314-35, and PP-1314-13 to the March 13, 2014 Planning Commission meeting, passed by a vote of 5-0.

* * *

Item No. 8, being:
750 IMHOFF, L.L.C.

8A. R-1314-99 – 750 IMHOFF, L.L.C. REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION TO HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 750 IMHOFF ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report
3. Pre-Development Summary

8B. O-1314-36 – 750 IMHOFF, L.L.C. REQUESTS REZONING FROM C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, TO RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 750 IMHOFF ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Site Plan

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson – There are two applications for this site. The 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan amendment: currently the site is designated as commercial. There is a car wash on that site that has been out of business for several years. To the south and north there is high density residential. To the west there is low density residential. To the east there is the University property. As proposed, this would pull this into the high density residential designation as well.

The rezoning application is for C-1 to RM-6. There is R-3 that goes around the west side and the south side of this proposal, commercial to the east, and then there's R-3 which, again, is the University housing to the north across Imhoff. There is additional RM-6 continuing south down Chautauqua. This is the existing land use in the area. Again, University housing to the north and the high density surrounding this tract of land.

This is the car wash itself. The commercial on the corner – the 7-Eleven. There's a Sonic to the south of the 7-Eleven there at that corner. This area where the concrete blocks are – in the staff report it was noted that there is a cross-access agreement that this will be the portion of the area that the multi-family development will access on the west side of the 7-Eleven and to the Sonic as well. That curb area there is essentially close to where they would be entering the apartment complex. This is the multi-family development to the west, which has been in place since the mid-1970s. I believe that there are 112 units in that complex. This is going down the west side of this lot. That existing multi-family will be a buffer between this development and the single family that is to the west of that existing apartment complex. Again, that existing apartment complex is on the south side of this proposal. This is the University housing that's across Imhoff, and that development consists of 192 units.

This application is consisting of five 4-story buildings and they're all under one roof. They're connected with one roof that would be open on the sides – a breezeway, essentially. There's 23 residential units – 78 beds. The current zoning ordinance requires 41 parking spaces – and I apologize, in the staff report I said 40, but it should be 41 – and the development is designed with 78 parking spaces located throughout the complex.

I also need to update for the Norman Board of Park Commissioners. They met on February 6 and a fee in lieu of land decision was proposed and received a unanimous approval for that.

With the close proximity to the University and the other multi-family developments that are out there that I showed you on the map, and the easy access to State Highway 9, it makes an appropriate infill project. Staff does recommend approval of Resolution No. R-1314-99 and

Ordinance No. O-1314-36. The applicant is here and he does have a presentation for you as well.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Tom McCaleb, engineer for the applicant – Rick McKinney is the architect; he will talk to you in a few minutes. This piece of property is an infill project. It's already final platted. Its legal description is Lot 2, Block 1 of the Sherwood South 2nd Addition, a Replat of the same. It's significant that this is already platted. Infrastructure is already in place – water, sewer, drainage all that's done. Curb cuts done. No additional requests; no changes for that. It's done. I did that plat, and when I did it it had the 7-Eleven at the corner and we divvied it up around the 7-Eleven. We put in the Sonic and put in the car wash. The car wash has been there for a while; it is now not washing cars. The applicant has looked at this property carefully. It's constrained. It's small. But it's big enough. So with the infrastructure and the proximity of the size, he has asked the architect to do a lot of work, and he has. We're going to take the detention pond – if you've been to the site, you've seen a hole in the ground. I'm going to cover that hole up – put a parking lot on top of it. The volume of the pond will be the same. We've got detention already done. We've got the water and the sewer and access. No additional traffic report was required. We also retained a traffic engineer and he came to the conclusion that this did not justify a warrant and staff has agreed. So, with that, I'm going to let Rick McKinney tell you some of the architectural stuff that I have no idea what he's talking about.

2. Rick McKinney, McKinney Partnership Architects, 3600 West Main Street – We're pleased to present this to you today. We're excited about the potential for this. If I can tell you a couple more features about the project. There are five buildings. It's four-story. RM-6 zoning typically allows 3 story, and if you set back an additional 5' you can go to 4 stories, which we have on that west property line, so our setbacks are adequate. We have sixteen 4-bedroom units and seven 2-bedroom units. Some of the other features in the project: we have a fitness center. We have study lounges. We have five buildings and, like she said, they're connected with open breezeways. One of the features the applicant requested was a very secure facility, so pedestrian access into the project will be card or fob access. Also, in the back of the project, the back portion of the parking will have a gate access, as well as covered parking, and there will be detention underneath that parking lot. All of the coverage ratios on the site – the coverage, open space, impervious area, floor area ratio, and recreation space are met or exceeded. Actually, the impervious area increased from where it was before – we have more green space than the car wash offered. The landscape will meet all of the City regulations, or exceed that. On the site plan you can see one feature we're having. This area will be an active lawn for the project; this will be more of a quiet lawn for the project and we're actually going to introduce a rock water feature inside this west courtyard. We're going to surround the entire project with at least a 6' fence, possibly an 8' fence. It will wrap the entire project here, all the way down, all the way across, and also buffer here from the Sonic development and along the back behind the 7-Eleven. We are also proposing a roof deck on top that will have all the appropriate code features and the guard rails. It will be about 1,500 square feet. The roof on this project is flat; it will drain to remove the water. There's an egress stair here that is enclosed; there's an egress stair here – I mean, they're about ¾ enclosed – open air on one side. There's also an elevator in the middle of the project that goes up 5 floors – it goes all the way to the roof deck to provide access for all occupants to all parts of the project. One last feature here, in between these two units – this is one building, this is another building, and then these are glassed in study lounges, because with 4 bedrooms this will be a quiet area where each floor will have an independent lounge that they'll be able to have access to. This is the front entry off the parking area. It will be card access here as well. We are hoping to be able to preserve some of the concrete in front and not have to tear it up and then repour it, so we would like to reuse that if we can. If we can't – if it doesn't have the right slope or drainage, obviously we would fix that. The materials on the project are masonry. There's some accent panels, some full-height glass. Some of it is tinted. There's some stucco. Different ratios and then masonry on all the buildings.

There may be some high graphics. All of our signage – we're hoping to identify each building for easy accessibility and identification. There will be some project signage maybe up high on one of the areas.

A couple of other things. Tom mentioned the underground detention. All the ratios. I think what is really important is the buffer – we're at four stories. Immediately to the right it's two stories – a fairly broad swath of apartments. Across the street is three stories and then beyond that there's townhouses, and then beyond that is single family. So I think the tiered density coming up to this, and then on the other side there's commercial and they look out into the University campus. I think it's appropriate for that location. And also the way we positioned all these units – none of these units look in each other's windows; they all have privacy looking out. We're excited about it, and I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

One other thing. We will provide the required number of adaptable and accessible units on the ground floor for these type units.

3. Ms. Gordon – It looks from this plan that most of the parking spaces are in this back lot – in the south lot. Is that correct? So is the only access to that back lot by driving between the 7-Eleven and the Sonic?

4. Mr. McKinney – Or behind. Yes. Again, out of trying to be green and save materials, this driveway would be maintained. This driveway is maintained. There is cross easements through here and through here that all of these three users will be able to use. The dumpster is located right here in the middle where there's common collection between all three projects.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-99 and Ordinance No. O-1314-36 to City Council. Jim Gasaway seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Curtis McCarty, Jim Gasaway, Andy Sherrer, Sandy Bahan
NAYES	Cindy Gordon
MEMBERS ABSENT	Roberta Pailes, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-99 and Ordinance No. O-1314-36 to City Council, passed by a vote of 4-1.

* * *

Item No. 9, being:

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION

None

* * *

Item No. 10, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.



Norman Planning Commission